UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,654	07/05/2007	**Ilan Vadai**	P-9050-US	9620

49443 7590 09/11/2009

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway
12th Floor
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER	
WHITE, RODNEY BARNETT	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3636	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/588,654	VADAI, ILAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney B. White	3636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/07/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 6, the phrase "retracted or folded" is unclear and confusing language. When Applicant uses the word "or", the claim reads as if Applicant is unsure of his invention. Applicant needs to pick one or the other between "retracted" or "folded" and be consistent throughout the claims, especially since "folded" and "retracted" is not one in the same. Applicant repeats this error in claims 4, 7-8, and 11 when he uses "deploys or collapses", "can deploy or collapse", and "anchors or latches", respectively.

The aforementioned problems render the claims vague and indefinite. Clarification and/or correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks (GB 2 220 848 A) in view of Czernakowski (U.S. Patent No. 5,409,294).

Sparks teaches the structure substantially as claimed including a collapsible child safety seat device for use in a vehicle, the device comprising a seating portion pivotally connected to a back support, the back support comprising a backrest portion and a headrest portion, wherein the seating portion and back support may be folded together, and wherein the headrest portion can be folded to at least partially overlap with the backrest portion, whereby the collapsible child safety seat device can be transformed between a deployed position where all the parts are deployed and a compact position where all the parts are collapsed, wherein the seating portion has a top surface and a bottom surface, the back support has a front surface and a back surface, and wherein the seating portion may be folded such that the bottom surface of the seating portion is. brought towards the back surface of the back support but does not teach that the seating portion and the back support may be laterally narrowed. However, Czernakowski teaches the concept of laterally narrowing a child seat by having two or parts that can be moved, wherein the device is provided with a deployment mechanism that deploys or collapses one or more of the parts, with respect to each other and between a deployed position and a narrowed position, wherein the deployment mechanism translates motion in one direction to motion in another direction,

wherein the motion in one axis is forced directly by a user, wherein the deployment mechanism slidably deploys one or more parts, wherein the deployment mechanism can deploy or collapse some or all of the parts simultaneously, the seat having a restrainer, the restrainer comprising one or more straps, wherein each or the portions comprises at least one continuous rigid member to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art to modify the child seat, as taught by Sparks, to include the ability to narrow, as taught by Czernakowski, since it would allow the child seat to be used by children of different ages and sizes.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks (GB 2 220 848 A) in view of Czernakowski (U.S. Patent No. 5,409,294) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barley et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,466,044).

Sparks in view of Czernakowski teach the structure substantially as claimed but does not teach the plurality of rigid anchors or latches for anchoring the device to the vehicle. However, Barley et al teaches anchors and/or latches for securing a child seat to a vehicle to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art to modify the child seat, as taught by Sparks in view of Czernakowski, to include anchors and latches for securing the child seat to the vehicle as taught by Barley et al, since such an arrangement would provide a secure attachment of the child seat to the vehicle.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks (GB 2 220 848 A) in view of Czernakowski (U.S. Patent No. 5,409,294) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Burleigh et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,588).

Sparks in view of Czernakowski teach the structure substantially as claimed but does not teach the plurality of rigid anchors or latches for anchoring the device to the vehicle. However, Burleigh et al teaches anchors and/or latches for securing a child seat to a vehicle to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art to modify the child seat, as taught by Sparks in view of Czernakowski, to include anchors and latches for securing the child seat to the vehicle as taught by Burleigh et al, since such an arrangement would provide a secure attachment of the child seat to the vehicle.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure because it teaches similar concepts of collapsible and laterally collapsible child seats.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney B. White whose telephone number is (571)272-6863. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM-3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dunn David can be reached on (571) 272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rodney B. White/
Primary Examiner,
Art Unit 3636
September 9, 2009